

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE 05/655, 336 07/23/96 WA	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATT	ORNEY_DOCKET_NO.
VIDAS ARRETT & STEINKRAUS	QM31/0112	RODRIGU	MINER.
SUITE 2000 6109 BLUE CIRCLE DRIVE MINNEAPOLIS MN 55343-9131		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		DATE MAILED:	01/12/99

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	A-	TORNEY DOCKET NO.
			EXAMINER	
•				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				19
		DAT	TE MAILED:	

Be	elow is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this	application
	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS	O 12 -
	ADVISORY ACTION	(m//cD=
THE PERIO	DD FOR RESPONSE:	CORHINE McDERMOTT PRIMARY EXAMINER
a) is exten	nded to run or continues to run 3 mont	from the date of the final rejection
b) expires	three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing nowever, will the statutory period for the response expire later than s	date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no x months from the date of the final rejection.
purpose	tension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1 to on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed it is of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amill be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory	s the date of the response and also the date for the
Appellant's	Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).	
Applicant's to place the	response to the final rejection, filed $\frac{12/28/98}{}$ has been of application in condition for allowance:	onsidered with the following effect, but it is not deemed
1. The prop	posed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be ente	red and the final rejection stands because:
a. 🔲 Ti pr	here is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the properties of the convincing showing showing the convincing showing show	sed amendment is necessary and was not earlier
b. 🗌 ТІ	ney raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or	search. (See Note).
с. 🔲 ТІ	hey raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).	
. d. □ π a	hey are not deemed to place the application in better form for apper ppeal.	al by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
e. 🔲 🏗	hey present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding nu	mber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
2. Newty p	proposed or amended claims would be allowed allowable claims.	f submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling
3. Upon the be as fol	e filing an appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered lows:	will not be entered and the status of the claims will
Claims a	ullowed:	CAR
Claims o	ejected to:	
Cidalis (However:	
□ Арр	licant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. The affid	tavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but moveled a subject of the stage of show The	does not overcome the rejection because The Evanium
IMX	and or serves to mat of Theprior as 1.	although produced by a different process
presente	avit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not showed.	n good and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier
The proposed	drawing correction has has not been approved by the e	raminer.
Other Op	plicant has not provided inde	in establishing an unabirous,
assume	at that a suined product and To	us unexperted results is a
TOL-303 (REV. 5-8	nd without any supporting existen	reminer. The prior out product an allegation with the prior out product an allegation unexpected results is a set supposed the allegation, it thoughton US POR 1997 AND 1997
	- Mary Sugar	de clase Hon so required